Worksheet
Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE: Humboldt River Field Office, LLNVW01000

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-NV-W010-2013-0015-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER:

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Holloway (G4ZC) Fire Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION

Aerial Seeding

T. 48 N., R. 34 E., sec.32-34
T. 47 N., R. 31 E., sec.1, 10-14, 24-26
T. 47 N., R. 32 E., sec.1, 6-9, 11-14, 16-20, 22-35
T. 47 N., R. 33 E., sec.1-6,7-12,13-15,18,19,22-24,25-27,30,34-36
T. 47 N., R. 34 E., sec.1-6,7-12,14-18,19-23,26-30,31-35
T. 46 N., R. 31 E., sec.25, 26, 35, 36
T. 46 N., R. 32 E., sec.2-4, 9-17, 20-28, 31-35
T. 46 N., R. 33 E., sec.1-3, 11-13, 18, 19, 29-32
T. 46 N., R. 34 E., sec.2-27, 34, 35
T. 45 N., R. 31 E., sec.1, 2, 12
T. 45 N., R. 32 E., sec.1-30, 33-36
T. 45 N., R. 33 E., sec.5-7, 17-20, 28-32
T. 44 N., R. 32 E., sec.1-4, 10-15, 28
T. 44 N., R. 33 E., sec.5-8, 17-20

Road Repair

T. 44 N., R. 33 E., sec. 16/17

Invasive Plants Management

Inventory and control within the Holloway Fire Perimeter

Stream Stabilization

Any stream channel within the Holloway Fire Perimeter.

Hand Planting

Within any area proposed for aerial seeding within Holloway Fire Perimeter (specified above)

Hand Seeding

Within any area proposed for aerial seeding, and within noxious weed control projects that occur within the Holloway Fire perimeter.

Livestock Grazing Closure

Livestock grazing closure within all areas burned by the Holloway Fire.

APPLICANT (if any): Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

The Holloway fire was ignited by lightning on 8/05/2012.

Resource Type	***Acres/Miles Burned***
Preliminary Priority Sage-grouse Habitat	134,593 Acres
Preliminary General Sage-grouse Habitat	37,406 Acres
Year-round Mule Deer Habitat	101,205 Acres
Crucial Winter Mule Deer Range	12,935 Acres
Summer Mule Deer Range	96,693 Acres
Agricultural Mule Deer Range	4,628 Acres
Winter Pronghorn Habitat	13,031 Acres
Summer Pronghorn Habitat	195,350 Acres
Agricultural Pronghorn Habitat	992 Acres
Low-density Pronghorn Habitat	6,523 Acres
Bighorn Sheep Occupied Habitat	48,835 Acres
Bighorn Sheep Potential Habitat	96,000 Acres
Lahontan Cutthroat Trout Occupied Stream	9.4 Miles
Lahontan Cutthroat Trout Recovery Stream	32 Miles
Allotment Fence	250 Miles
Allotments:	
Washburn	239 Acres
Jordan Meadows	2,170 Acres
Wilder-Quinn	15,721 Acres
Coyote Hills	15,721 Acres
Horse Creek	26,765 Acres
Bilk Creek	38,404 Acres
Kings River	65,720 Acres
Little Horse Creek	3,532 Acres

There are four streams affected by the Holloway Fire that are occupied with Lahontan cutthroat trout. These streams are Corral Canyon Creek, Line Canyon Creek, Riser Creek, and Sage Creek.

Log Cabin Creek, House Creek, Rodeo Creek, Raster Creek, Cold Springs Creek, and Kings River area all identified as Lahontan cutthroat trout Recovery watersheds.

Potential Vegetation/Soils:

The Holloway Fire spanned 37 different ecological sites. Several of these sites (17) comprise less than one percent of the fire area and have been excluded from the following breakdown, the remainder of the sites make up 1-20 percent of the fire area, and include:

Ecological Site ID	Ecological Site	Habitat Type	Acres	Percent of Fire (WDO)
R023XY053NV	GRAVELLY NORTH SLOPE	ARTR4/FEID	2237.67	1.04
R024XY005NV	LOAMY 10-12 P.Z.	ARTRW/ACTH7	2252.96	1.05
R023XY057NV	GRANITIC LOAM 10-12 P.Z.	ARTRW8/ACTH7-PSSPS	2328.87	1.08
R024XY028NV	SOUTH SLOPE 8-12 P.Z.	ARTR2/PSSPS	2661.78	1.23
R023XY064NV	SOUTH SLOPE 16+ P.Z.	ARTRV-PUTR2/PSSPS-BRMA4-LECI4	2867.88	1.33
R024XY005NV	LOAMY 8-10 P.Z.	ARTRW/ACTH7	4476.54	2.08
R023XY008NV	MOUNTAIN RIDGE	ARAR8/FEID-POA	4511.45	2.09
R023XY007NV	CLAYPAN 10-14 P.Z.	ARTRV/FEID-PSSPS	4548.50	2.11
R023XY020NV	LOAMY 10-12 P.Z.	ARTR2/PSSPS-ACTH7	6592.28	3.06
R023XY007NV	LOAMY 14-16 P.Z.	ARTRV/FEID-PSSPS	7339.26	3.41
R023XY019NV	LOAMY 16+ P.Z.	ARTRV/BRMA4-ACHNA	7443.04	3.45
R024XY020NV	DROUGHTY LOAM 8-10 P.Z.	ARTRW/ACTH7-ACHY	7488.90	3.47
R023XY043NV	GRANITIC SLOPE 14-16 P.Z.	ARTRV/FEID-PSSPS	8061.22	3.74
R023XY006NV	LOAMY 8-10 P.Z.	ARTRW8/ACTH7-ACHY	9507.04	4.41
R023XY054NV	STEEP NORTH SLOPE	ARTRV/FEID	13101.86	6.08
R023XY031NV	CLAYPAN 10-14 P.Z.	ARAR8/PSSPS-ACTH7	14396.33	6.68

R023XY042NV	GRANITIC SOUTH SLOPE 12-14 P.Z.	ARTRV/PSSPS	16177.46	7.51
R023XY017NV	CLAYPAN 14-16 P.Z.	ARAR8/FEID-PSSPS	18017.65	8.36
R023XY018NV	STONY SOUTH SLOPE 12-16 P.Z.	ARTRV/PSSPS-LECI4	24488.39	11.36
R023XY039NV	LOAMY SLOPE 10-14 P.Z.	ARTRW8/PSSPS	41965.41	19.47

Vegetation Treatments

Previous Vegetation Treatments within the fire area included:

- A 2,300 acre drill seeding for the Wilder Fire in 1985 along the western flank of the Holloway Fire consisting of crested wheatgrass, alfalfa, intermediate wheatgrass, and small burnet.
- Over 2,600 acres were aerially seeded just north of Kings River Valley following the 1996 Kings River Fire. Species included: Wyoming big sagebrush, four-wing saltbush, forage kochia, blue flax, tall wheatgrass, intermediate wheatgrass, and alfalfa.
- Over 10,600 acres were drill seeded along the western border of the fire perimeter (along the western portions of the Bilk Creek Mountains) during rehabilitation efforts for the 1999 Denio Fire; species included flax, forage kochia, Wyoming big sagebrush, four-wing saltbush, intermediate wheatgrass, crested wheatgrass and bluebunch wheatgrass.
- The Cherry Creek Fire occurred in 2000 on the southern tip of the Holloway Fire perimeter; 3,595 acres were aerially seeded with Wyoming big sagebrush, and 1,690 acres were drill seeded (spp. unknown)
- The 2011 Horse Creek Fire was aerially seeded with Wyoming big sagebrush (200 acres).

A. Description of the Proposed Action with attached map(s) and any applicable mitigation measures.

Stream Stabilization

This project proposes to perform streambank stabilization in severely burned target areas (as determined by ID team specialists) in streams within the Holloway Fire burned area. Project areas will be identified by BLM specialists in response to resource damage that has not been inventoried at this time, or in response to unacceptably slow recovery of natural vegetation within riparian corridors. Actual implementation acres would be less than 50.

Treatments would include installing live willow, red-osier dogwood, or cottonwood stakes to expedite woody debris recruitment, reduce sediment transport, and minimize

stream bank scouring. Live stakes would penetrate the soil approximately 10-18" and would be installed in target areas occupying 30'-100' of stream course (maximum). Wood-fiber or straw mulch (certified weed-free) would be utilized to reduce surface erosion and enhance seed germination and seedling establishment of broadcasted seed in or adjacent to riparian areas.

Other structural changes could include selectively placing fire-killed brush/tree skeletons into the stream channel to reduce water velocity, increase sediment retention *in situ*, and reduce excessive sediment deposition downstream of problem areas.

Watersheds have not been fully inventoried for riparian erosion issues as of 12/27/2012, and erosional issues caused by wildfire are frequently not identified until during or after the first or second wet season. Watersheds will be inventoried for vegetative recovery within the riparian areas, sedimentation issues, and potential/existing stream bank instability by BLM professionals during 2013, 2014, and 2015.

Road Repair

This project proposes to restore proper drainage on the 9-Mile Summit road where rainfall from summer cloudbursts has resulted in a plugged culvert and debris across the roadbed. Road repair at this site would include ditch cleanout, removal of debris from roadway, and repair/replacement of culvert damaged by summer flash flood event.

Closures

Full or partial temporary livestock grazing closures would be implemented for the Wilder-Quinn, Coyote Hills, Horse Creek, Bilk Creek, Kings River, and Little Horse Creek Allotments.
Temporary Closures would be in effect until the objectives have been met. Temporary Closure objectives are defined in the pending Notice of Grazing Closure Final Decision issued to the permittees by the Field Office Manager.

Existing allotment and pasture fences damaged by the fire would be repaired in accordance with the current permanent fence specifications between October 2012 and April 2014.

Aerial Seeding

This project proposes to aerially seed up to 84,000 acres of Sage Grouse Preliminary Priority Habitat (PPH) and/or Preliminary General Habitat (PGH) with native seeds. The seed mix would be based on availability, adaptation, and probability of success and be consistent with the National Technical Team 2011 Sage-Grouse Conservation Measures. The proposed seed mixes would include mountain big sagebrush, Wyoming big sagebrush, basin big sagebrush, antelope bitterbrush, western yarrow, Lewis' flax, basin wildrye, Indian ricegrass, and blue-bunch wheatgrass. Other site-adapted native species may be used to augment or substitute for the identified species, depending on cost and

availability. This seeding would occur between December 2012 and March 2013, with potential augmentation seeding projects occurring between December 2013-March 2014 and December 2014-March 2015.

Aerial seeding would occur within the Disaster Peak Wilderness Study Area (WSA). Only site-adapted native plant species will be seeded within the WSA.

Up to 10,000 acres, occurring within the low elevation Wyoming sage ecosystem may be aerially seeded with forage kochia, crested wheatgrass, and/or Siberian wheatgrass, depending on availability and cost. These non-native species would represent a smaller proportion of a largely native mix, with Indian ricegrass, basin wildrye, and Wyoming big sagebrush being the foundation of the mix. Forage kochia and crested wheatgrass have been introduced within the proposed project area during historic seeding operations.

All areas proposed for aerial seeding were identified as severely burned using the Burned Area Reflectance Classification (BARC) system. Project areas were selected for treatment if the area was both severely burned and also identified as Sage Grouse PPH. In some instances, Sage Grouse PGH would be targeted if it occurs as mosaic habitat within areas that are principally Sage Grouse PPH.

Hand planting

Up to 90 acres may be hand planted in the first season following the Holloway Fire with sagebrush species, antelope bitterbrush, mountain mahogany or other site adapted native plants within areas identified for aerial seeding operations. Both container and bare-root plant stock may be utilized, depending on availability.

Up to 2000 acres may be hand planted in the second or third season following the Holloway Fire with site adapted native plants within areas identified for aerial seeding operations. Both container and bare-root plant stock may be utilized, depending on availability. Sagebrush species will make up the bulk of the installed planting stock. Antelope bitterbrush, mountain mahogany, blue elderberry, and Utah serviceberry are also likely candidates for hand planting.

Planting areas would be targeted based on burn severity, pre-fire habitat values for Sage Grouse and other wildlife species, efficacy of aerial seeding operations, and distance to existing seed sources in unburned areas. Hand planting would be done in areas previously inventoried by a Class III cultural survey or in areas not requiring a Class III cultural survey (such as slopes exceeding 30%, or in previously disturbed areas). Sites recognized by the National Register of Historic Places will be avoided. Nevada State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) concurrence will be obtained in accordance with the State Protocol Agreement between the BLM and Nevada SHPO.

Invasive Plants and Noxious Weeds Management

Noxious weeds and non-native invasive plants, particularly Scotch and Canada thistle,

are known to occur within the area affected by the Holloway Fire and would be inventoried within the proposed project area. Both existing and new infestations would be treated with BLM approved herbicides as appropriate, and in compliance with BLM operating procedures and label requirements for BLM approved herbicides. 200 acres are anticipated/proposed for treatment in year one, and 200 acres (either re-treatment or new infestation treatments) each in year two and three (all treatments would be initiated in early spring or mid-to-late fall). Hand seeding in noxious weed infested areas would be coordinated with any other control efforts (see Hand Seeding, below).

Canada thistle has been previously documented in the riparian areas of Bilk Creek and tributaries of Kings River. It is probable that noxious weed inventory efforts will locate previously unmapped infestations elsewhere within the fire perimeter. Scotch thistle has been observed near Log Cabin Creek on both public and private lands and is expected to occur intermittently throughout the burned area. Small populations of tamarisk have been documented within the Bilk Creek riparian area.

Treatments may include one or more of the following chemicals depending on species present in project location:

Imazipyr
Glyphosate
2,4-D
Picloram
Dicamba
Metsulphuron methyl
Clorsulphuron

Aerial application of herbicides is not proposed within the Holloway Fire area.

Hand Seeding

Select species would be hand-seeded within areas proposed for aerial seeding in order to maximize seeding efficacy with limited quantity and/or exceptionally costly seed. Species may include Palmer's penstemon, royal penstemon, antelope bitterbrush, or any other site-adapted native species used in concert with, or as substitutions to these species. Native plant species would be broadcast in noxious weed infested areas as part of an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) strategy. Native plant species and annual sunflower (*Helianthus annuus*) would be broadcast at Scotch thistle control projects. Annual sunflower has been shown to compete effectively with annual invasive plants when seeded into disturbed soils, while having a negligible or beneficial effect on the long term recruitment of desirable perennial plants over time. (Perry et. al, 2009) Hand seeding as part of noxious weed control would not exceed the proposed annual treatment acres described in the "Invasive Plants and Noxious Weeds Management" section (above).

Monitoring

Through the development of the Holloway Fire Rehabilitation Plan, the interdisciplinary team has recommended vegetation treatments to stabilize soils, prevent the invasion of non-native invasive and/or noxious weed species, and to re-introduce vegetative species to the range sites. Monitoring will be completed to analyze the effectiveness and success of the rehabilitation treatments. Representative monitoring sites will be established to monitor density and cover of the seeded species, natural recovery and noxious and/or invasive weed encroachment. Density and cover measurements will be utilized to determine the effectiveness of seeding treatments. Photo points will also be established to qualitatively assess and document site conditions through time.

Sampling sites will be randomly generated. Effectiveness monitoring will include a combination of the following methods as outlined in BLM Technical Reference 1734-4 (BLM 1996) and Monitoring Manual for Grassland Shrubland and Savanna Ecosystems (Herrick et. al 2005).

Plant Density Quadrats: Density will be used to quantify seedling establishment success for the first three growing seasons. A 3ft² frame will be used to record seedling density along 3 transects which will be set up at pre-determined azimuths.

Photo Points: Photos will be taken of each transect from the center stake within the sampling plot at a standard height (1.5 m). Photo points will be used to qualitatively document site conditions and may show change that is indicated by quantitative data.

Monitoring will be oriented toward addressing the following questions: 1) Have the desirable species been successfully established and do they provide sufficient cover to adequately protect the site from soil erosion? 2) Is there evidence that a self-sustaining community has established? 3) Are vegetative reproduction and establishment of the desirable species occurring? When possible, all monitoring sites will have adjacent, non-treated reference sites established to compare results of treatments. Density and cover measurements will be utilized to determine the effectiveness of the seeding treatment.

ESR treatment efficacy objectives are defined as follows:

For livestock grazing closures:

1. Objectives for temporary livestock grazing closure are defined within the livestock grazing closure decision record(s) and are allotment specific.

For aerially seeded areas:

1. Obtain an average of 1 seeded, desirable, perennial plant per square meter.
2. Obtain an average of 1 sagebrush plant per 3 square meters (only where sagebrush seed is included within seed mix)
3. Obtain 50% or greater perennial cover of the low potential perennial plant cover for the appropriate ecological site.
4. Obtain the above results by the end of the third year after fire containment, which

occurred on 08/25/2012.

For hand planting:

1. Obtain an overall seedling survival rate of 70% or greater after the end of the first dry season (estimated to occur from June-October) after planting.
2. Obtain an overall seedling survival rate of 50% or greater after the end of the second dry season (estimated to occur from June-October) after planting.
3. Obtain new shoot production on 50% or greater of surviving plants during the second growing season after planting.

For invasive species management:

1. Thoroughly inventory and document areas infested by noxious weeds within the Holloway Fire perimeter.
2. Prohibit noxious weed infestations from expanding beyond their current size, and reduce or eliminate infestations were possible, with critical resource areas being prioritized for control efforts.
3. Remove noxious weeds to allow for recruitment of native or desirable perennial plants.

For stream stabilization activities:

1. Monitor stream and riparian habitats to allow for comparison of post-fire impacts to existing baseline (pre-fire) information.

For areas identified as natural recovery areas:

1. Achieve 20% (or greater) of the lower potential perennial cover identified for the relevant ecological site (or range site where ecological site description has not been established) by the end of the third year after fire containment, which occurred on 08/25/2012.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name*_ Paradise Denio Management Framework Plan (MFP)
Date Approved__1982_____

*List applicable LUPs (for example, resource management plans; activity, project, management, or program plans; or applicable amendments thereto)

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

The proposed treatments are in conformance with **the Paradise-Denio MFP:**

Wildlife MFPIII Decisions WL-1.21 P.D.: Maintain and improve habitat for sensitive, protected, threatened and endangered species listed on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Endangered and Threatened List, BLM-Nevada Department of Wildlife Sensitive Species List and those existing Federal and state laws and regulations.

Paradise-Denio MFP, Standard Operating Procedures: .45 Soil-Water-Air
"Consider rehabilitation areas which have had protective vegetative cover destroyed by wildfire…Utilize seeding or other watershed stabilization techniques as required. Rehabilitation must be protected from grazing until adequate seedling establishment has been attained."

The proposed treatments are in conformance with the **Winnemucca Field Office Fire Management Plan, 2004,** which states:

1. "Break up monocultures through the use of chemical, biological, and/or mechanical means to stop the spread of the affected area especially in areas that border important habitats."

2."Seed areas with perennial grass species to reduce the dominance of cheatgrass…Non-fire fuels treatments would be utilized to achieve resource goals and objectives based on site-specific habitat conditions"

The proposed action in is conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objective, terms, and conditions):

Paradise-Denio MFP (1982)
Although not specifically addressed, weed treatments conform to wildlife, range, and watershed objectives **(WLA 1.12, RM2.1**), which includes improving and maintaining habitat quantity, quality, diversity, and production by artificial methods when appropriate.

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

- **Vegetation Treatment on BLM Lands in Thirteen Western States Environmental Impact Statement** Record of Decision 1991.
- **Normal Year Fire Rehabilitation Plan Environmental Assessment** EA# NV-020-04-21, Decision Record and Finding of No Significant Impact 8/19/04.

- **Vegetation Treatment Using Herbicides on BLM Lands in Seventeen Western States Programmatic Final Environmental Impact Statement,** Record of Decision 9/29/07.
- **Integrated Weed Management Environmental Assessment** NV-020-02-19, Decision Record and Finding of No Significant Impact 8/27/02.

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report).

- **IM 2012-043 Greater Sage Grouse Interim Management Policies Procedures/A Report on National Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Measures.** Produced by: Sage-grouse National Technical Team, 12/21/2011 (pp. 27)
- **IM 2012-044 BLM National Greater Sage-Grouse Land Use Plan Strategy**
- **Native Cover Crops Suppress Exotic Annuals and Favor Native Perennials in a Greenhouse Competition Experiment** (Perry, Plant Ecology, February 2009)
- **USFWS Utah Field Office Guidelines for Raptor Protection From Human and Land Use Disturbances (2002)**
- **USFWS Biological Opinion for the Normal Year Fire Rehabilitation Plan** (August 2004)

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA documents(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?

Documentation of answer and explanation:
The Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan EA NV-020-04-21 (DR/FONSI 8/19/04), addresses the proposed treatments including broadcast seeding, aerial seeding, hand and aerial seeding within WSA, fence repair, stream stabilization, hand planting, road repair, and livestock grazing closure. Control of noxious weeds is analyzed in the Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan EA NV-020-04-21 (DR/FONSI 8/19/04), Integrated Weed Management EA NV-020-02-19 (DR/FONSI 8/27/02) and the Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on Bureau of Land Management Lands in 17 Western States EIS (ROD 9/29/07). With the exception of non-riparian hand planting, all projects are specifically analyzed within the identified Environmental Assessments. The areas proposed for non-riparian hand planting are conceptually identical to hand planting in riparian areas, and the proposed geographic and resource conditions are sufficiently similar to those analyzed with that document.

The majority of the project acres were known habitat for Greater Sage Grouse before the Holloway Fire occurred. Greater Sage Grouse are a candidate species for listing under the Endangered Species Act, and are currently a BLM sensitive species. Effects to Sage Grouse and Sage Grouse habitat from ESR activities were analyzed in the Winnemucca District Normal Year Fire Rehabilitation Plan, which states that one of the principle functions of the ESR program is "to restore habitats that fall within Sage-Grouse/sagebrush obligate species use areas."

- The proposed suite of actions are in compliance with IM NV 2012-043, "Greater Sage-Grouse Interim Management Policies and Procedures (December 2011) and IM 2012-044 BLM National Greater Sage-Grouse Land Use Plan Strategy.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA documents(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?

Documentation of answer and explanation:
Yes, the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA documents is appropriate with respect to the current proposed action and current environmental concerns, interests, resource values and circumstances.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, and updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation:
Yes, the existing analyses are adequate in regard to the proposed action. The proposed action and analysis of that action is in compliance with IM 2012-043, "Greater Sage-Grouse Interim Management Policies and Procedures (December 2011) and the "Report on National Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Measures" (December 2011) which guide policy in Sage Grouse habitat. Sage Grouse were identified as a BLM sensitive species in all relevant analysis documents and no change to that status has since occurred.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?

Documentation of answer and explanation:
Yes, the suite of actions proposed for the Holloway Fire rehabilitation project are precisely those actions which are identified and analyzed within the Normal Year Fire Rehab Plan EA 2004. Direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of noxious weeds management are analyzed across the entirety of the Winnemucca District in the Integrated Weed Management Environmental Assessment 2002.

5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation:
Yes, public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA documents are adequate. In addition, there has been Holloway ESR project-specific coordination with Nevada Department of Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, University of Nevada-Reno, Western Watersheds Project, Humboldt County, NV, Consultation with the Summit Lake Paiute tribe and McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone tribes, and discussion with affected livestock grazing permittees.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Name /Title	Resource/Agency Represented	Signature/Date	Comments (Attach if more room is needed)
Wes Barry	Range	Wes Barry /s/ 12/17/2012	
Rob Burton	Veg/Soils	Rob Burton /s/ 12/11/2012	
Mark Hall	NAC and Cultural	Mark Hall /s/ 12/13/12	
John McCann	Hydrology/Riparian	John McCann /s/ 12/11/2012	
Nancy Spencer-Morris	Wildlife	Nancy Spencer-Morris /s/ 12/16/2012	
Greg Lynch	Fisheries	Greg Lynch /s/ 12/11/2012	
Allie Henson	GIS	Allie Henson /s/ 12/13/2012	
Eric Baxter	ESR Lead	Eric Baxter /s/ 12/13/12	
NEPA	Lynn Ricci		
NEPA	Zwaantje Rorex	Zwaantje Rorex /s/ 12/17/2012	
Wild Horse and Burro	Melanie Mirati	Amanda DeForest /s/ 12/14/2012	No HMA's affected
Wilderness	Kristine Struck	Kristine Struck /s/ 12/14/2012	

Note: Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

[X] **Conclusion** *(If you found that one or more of these criteria is not met, you will not be able to check this box.)*

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM' compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

_Eric Baxter /s/ 12/17/2012_____
Signature of Project Lead

_Zwaantje Rorex /s/ 12/17/2012_____
Signature of NEPA Coordinator

_Edward Seum /s/ _____12/27/2012___
Signature of the Responsible Official Date

Note: The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal fewer than 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.

Attachment A: Environmental Protection Measures

Stream Stabilization will observe the following environmental protection measures:

1) All locations would be reviewed by a BLM wildlife biologist for presence of Threatened, Endangered, Sensitive, and Special Status Species. If biologist site review determines that any Threatened, Endangered, Sensitive, or Special Status species are present, the site would be dropped from consideration (avoided) until further NEPA analysis, US Fish and Wildlife Service consultation (as needed) and/or Documentation of NEPA Adequacy is successfully completed.

2) Any stream stabilization action proposed within a LCT-occupied watershed will not occur without coordination and consultation with US Fish and Wildlife Service.[i]

Road Repair

1) All work will occur within the existing, mapped road prism, and would be maintenance of existing administrative facilities. No new construction or improvements are proposed.

2) All terrestrial equipment (e.g. vehicles, hand tools, tractors, etc.) to be used in treatments will be washed offsite prior to being brought to the project site, to avoid spreading noxious weed seeds.[i]

Temporary Livestock Grazing Closures

1) Temporarily close the affected watershed and/or stream channel to permitted livestock grazing until objectives defined within the grazing closure decision are met. The appropriate length of time for temporary closure to livestock grazing will be determined on a site-specific basis based on monitoring/resource data, scientific principles, and subject matter expertise/professional observations. Site-specific monitoring will determine when resource objectives have been achieved on specific burned areas. Site-specific vegetative recovery objectives will be identified by the interdisciplinary review team and included in the Notice of Closure to Livestock Grazing issued in accordance with 43 CFR 4110.3-3, subject to the provisions of 43 CFR 4160.[i]

Aerial Seeding and Hand Seeding

1) No seeding would be allowed within or immediately adjacent to known and documented populations of special status plant species unless it is determined that the seeding would not be detrimental of the habitats or populations of the affected special status plant species.[i]

2) Aerial seeding within the Disaster Peak WSA will utilize only site-adapted native species seed.

3) Aircraft landing/loading operations will occur outside of the Disaster Peak WSA.

Hand Planting

1) Treatments will follow restriction based on avoidance buffers and season of use restriction within sage grouse habitat. All treatments identified will be in accordance with Instruction Memorandums WO-IM-2012-043, Greater Sage-Grouse Interim Management Policies and Procedures and WO-IM-2010-149, Sage-Grouse Conservation Related to Wildland Fire and Fuels Management.

2) For any proposed actions that are not performed outside of the migratory bird breeding season (March 1- August 31), a migratory bird nesting survey will be conducted by BLM wildlife specialists, or personnel approved by BLM wildlife specialists, in potential habitat areas no more than 10 days and no less than 3 days prior to initiation of disturbance. If active nests are located, a minimum 260 ft. protective buffer will be established or rehabilitation activities delayed until the birds have completed nesting and brood-rearing activities.

3) All National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligible or unevaluated sites will be avoided during the course of this project. A BLM archaeologist will be involved as detailed plans are developed for each phase of the implementation of this project to ensure avoidance is factored into the detailed project designs. An archaeologist will review plans for each phase of the project's implementation to ensure avoidance of NRHP eligible or unevaluated sites.

4) Any unanticipated archaeological discovery on BLM lands will be reported to a BLM archaeologist and work in the immediate vicinity will stop until SHPO and tribes are consulted by the line officer.

5) Prior to implementation of treatments, pygmy rabbit surveys will be conducted in areas of suitable habitat. A 400 ft. avoidance buffer will be established around any active pygmy rabbit burrows and burrow complexes found.

6) During the raptor breeding season, January 1 through August 31, control of noxious weeds would be implemented or delayed in accordance with spatial and

temporal recommendations defined in the Utah Field Office Guidelines for Raptor Protection from Human and Land Use Disturbances (USFWS 2002).

In addition, a burrowing owl survey will be conducted by BLM wildlife specialists or personnel approved by BLM wildlife specialists, in potential habitat areas no more than 10 days, and no less than 3 days prior to initiation of disturbance. If active burrows are located, a minimum 260 ft. protective buffer will be established or rehabilitation activities delayed until the birds have completed nesting and brood-rearing activities.

7) Existing, documented populations of lonesome milk vetch or other special status plants that occur near proposed treatment areas will be flagged and avoided.

8) No hand planting activities will be conducted within 0.6 miles of Sage Grouse lek sites during the sage-grouse lekking and nesting seasons from March 1st through June 30th. Greater Sage-Grouse nest and brood surveys in areas proposed for hand planting will be conducted no more than 10 days and no less than 3 days prior to initiation of disturbance. If active nests and/or broods are located, rehabilitation activities will be delayed until the grouse have voluntarily left the area.

9) All terrestrial equipment (e.g. vehicles, hand tools, tractors, etc.) to be used in treatments will be washed offsite prior to being brought to the project site, to avoid spreading noxious weed seeds.

Invasive Plants Management

1) Standard safety procedures and standard operating procedures would be strictly followed.[ii]

2) During the raptor breeding season, January 1 through August 31, control of noxious weeds would be implemented or delayed in accordance with spatial and temporal recommendations defined in the Utah Field Office Guidelines for Raptor Protection from Human and Land Use Disturbances (USFWS 2002).

Control of noxious weeds would not be conducted within 0.6 miles of active Sage Grouse leks during lekking and nesting season from March 1st through June 30th. Greater Sage-Grouse nest and brood surveys in areas proposed for noxious weeds control efforts will be conducted no more than 10 days and no less than 3 days prior to initiation of disturbance. If active nests and/or broods are located, rehabilitation activities will be delayed until the grouse have voluntarily left the area.

In addition, a burrowing owl survey will be conducted in potential habitat areas no more than 10 days and no less than 3 days prior to initiation of disturbance. If

active burrows are located, a minimum 260 ft. protective buffer will be established or rehabilitation activities delayed until the birds have completed nesting and brood-rearing activities.

3) For any proposed actions that are not performed outside of the migratory bird breeding season (March 1- August 31), a migratory bird nesting survey will be conducted in potential habitat areas no more than 10 days and no less than 3 days prior to initiation of disturbance. If active nests are located, a minimum 260 ft. protective buffer will be established or rehabilitation activities delayed until the birds have completed nesting and brood-rearing activities.

4) All landowners within the treatment areas are welcome to attend training of proper identification and growth stages of noxious weeds before treatment. Periodic compliance checks of the weed control activities would be done during the treatment period with the BLM and the affected landowners. A monitoring and evaluation program would be cooperatively developed between all the affected landowners within the treated sites to assess annual progress of the Integrated Weed Management Program. [ii]

5) The Nevada Division of Water Resources (NDWR) would be given the opportunity to review and comment on any proposed monitoring program. [ii]

6) Prior to any control efforts, Native American concerns would be solicited in accordance with the Native American consultation regulation and policy. [ii]

7) The Ft. McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone tribe will be given 2 weeks notification before any spray operations are conducted. [ii]

8) Herbicides would be calculated and purchased only in quantities needed to complete each BLM spot treatment and contractor applied treatment. Label directions would be strictly followed. [ii]

9) Prior to any chemical treatment, areas would be evaluated for the presence of riparian areas, special status plants and animals, or if they are cultural sites. No chemical application would occur within 50 yards of any Threatened, Endangered, Sensitive, or Special Status species. [ii]

10) Re-applications of the herbicide would not be less than the persistence factor identified for any product selected for use. [ii]

11) Ground applications of herbicides (including backpack and power sprayer) would be limited to spraying the target weeds and the surrounding ground for 10 feet. Backpack applications of liquids would occur only at low nozzle pressure and at ground level. Granular formulations would be applied by broadcast spreaders or by hand within 3.5’ of the ground. [ii]

12) Ground application of granular formulations would be done in wind speeds not exceeding 10 miles per hour (mph). Ground applications of liquids would not occur when wind speeds exceed 8 mph. [ii]

13) The BLM would notify the livestock grazing permittee(s) when herbicides are used on grazing allotments. Phenology of target species and multiple use objectives would also be considered. [ii]

14) The use of herbicides near water would be based on the buffer requirements established in the BLM Chemical Pest Control Manual, Handbook H-9011-1; distance from water (in horizontal feet) would be as follows: 10 feet backpack, 25 feet for vehicle mounted spreader of granular formulations, and 50 feet for vehicle mounted sprayer of liquids. [ii]

15) No herbicide application would be conducted when rain (greater than 50% chance) is predicted within 24 hours of treatment. The BLM would use the Interagency Fire Dispatch Center for weather reports for rain predictions. [ii]

16) Treatments will follow restriction based on avoidance buffers and season of use restriction within sage grouse habitat. All treatments identified will be in accordance with Instruction Memorandums WO-IM-2012-043, Greater Sage-Grouse Interim Management Policies and Procedures and WO-IM-2010-149, Sage-Grouse Conservation Related to Wildland Fire and Fuels Management.

17) Herbicides will be applied only by a state and federally certified pesticide applicator. All applications will be in accordance with the instructions and standard operating procedures identified on the product label(s).

---

[i] **Normal Year Fire Rehabilitation Plan Environmental Assessment** EA# NV-020-04-21, Decision Record and Finding of No Significant Impact 8/19/04.

[ii] **Integrated Weed Management Environmental Assessment** NV-020-02-19, Decision Record and Finding of No Significant Impact 8/27/02.